



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

249

CRM-M-33479-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.07.2025

VIKAS GROVER

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Pushpinder Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in FIR No.615 dated 10.08.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 506, 370, 120-B IPC and Sections 10 and 24 of Emigration Act, 1983 registered at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Parveen and Sumit have accepted a sum of Rs.35 lakhs to send the nephew of the complainant to USA. However, he was deported from Japan, and thereafter his passport was taken by Sumit and the said passport was lost. The allegations against the petitioner is



that he had accepted Rs.6 lakhs from the complainant on the pretext of sending the victim abroad. Although he is not named in the FIR and his name has come up during investigation conducted by the police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 22.01.2025 and has already undergone custody period of more than five months.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 04.07.2025 and further states that the petitioner is involved in 04 more cases and he is on bail in 01 out of 04 cases against him. He further states that challan has been presented and charges are yet to be framed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 05 months and 13 days and trial qua the petitioner is yet to commence and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate



concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

07th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No